

“WE ARE BOUND TOGETHER ON  
BY THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS.  
(Theodor Herzl in his “The Jewish State”).

NLP  
296  
ISA

# PALESTINE

Peace and Prosperity  
or  
War and Destruction?

## POLITICAL ZIONISM

Undemocratic, Unjust, Dangerous



By

SIR ISAAC ALFRED ISAACS, K.C.,  
P.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

Associate Knight of St. John of Jerusalem

"WE ARE BOUND TOGETHER ONLY  
BY THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS."  
(Theodor Herzl in his "The Jewish State").

# PALESTINE

Peace and Prosperity  
or  
War and Destruction?

# POLITICAL ZIONISM

Undemocratic, Unjust, Dangerous

By

SIR ISAAC ALFRED ISAACS, K.C.,  
P.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

Associate Knight of St. John of Jerusalem



#### ERRATA

- Page 8. Line 27, June 19 should read "June 3."  
" 22. Line 29, the first word should be "people."  
" 40. After line 25, read lines 26 and 27 from page  
41 opposite.  
" 49. Line 7 of paragraph marked "1", first word  
should be "character".

Page 6, Line 26 } For "proportion" read  
Page 7, Line 7 } "majority."



25 JUL 1946

## INTRODUCTION.

No more urgent and delicate task awaits the statesmanship of the United Nations, and particularly of the British Empire and the United States of America, than the solution of the problem of Palestine. The Anglo-American Commission just appointed is an appreciation of its complications and importance and the responsibilities that attend it. I hope that this brochure may help those who read it to understand the difficulties, the dangers and the various relative bearings of the problem.

That tiny spot of earth called Palestine presents at this moment all the possibilities of an explosion that might bring calamity to an immensely wider area, and wound the spiritual susceptibilities of countless millions of our fellow creatures of varying faiths.

The problem is many sided. It concerns directly and indirectly not alone the pressing necessities of finding there and elsewhere peaceful and humanitarian habitations for hundreds of thousands of Jewish victims of unspeakable atrocities at the hands of the Nazis and their accomplices, but it extends to the present rights of a still greater number of Arab inhabitants of Palestine, who constitute a majority of the population, and through them it touches the integrity and safety of our Empire and the preservation of peace. It is further, in some of its phases, intimately connected with the fundamental principles of democracy, and it even raises questions of retrogression to ancient and long since abandoned systems of national structure. Moreover, even viewing the matter from a purely Jewish standpoint, it concerns as I regard it, the honour of Judaism itself in respect of the basic principle of justice to our fellow-men that in the Scripture common to us all Jew and Christian alike, is so insistently inculcated. Along with these considerations, in themselves imperative,



the question involves spiritually the preservation of some of the most precious associations of three great faiths, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem.

This complicated problem with its attendant possibilities arises by reason of conflicting and unjustifiable extreme demands of Political Zionism on the one side and Arab nationalism on the other. It is not strictly speaking in all respects a contest between Jew and Arab. On the one hand there are moderate Arabs, on the other there is a very considerable portion of responsible Jewish world opinion that, like my own, is as opposed to the extreme demands of Political Zionism as to the equally extreme Arab claims. That is evidenced recently by the scholarly address of Rabbi Lazon on "Compromise in Palestine" at the American Academy of Political and Social Science, in which were represented the views of the American Council for Judaism, a body of considerable strength. The extreme demands of Political Zionism as a movement amount to a claim for Jewish dominance over all other inhabitants of Palestine now and in the future. Naturally all Jewish opinion is opposed to Arab dominance, but as it is inconceivable that the United Nations would permit such dominance I dismiss it once for all as outside all reasonable consideration.

Arab resistance to Jewish domination in Palestine has the firm and powerful support of the whole Moslem world, including 90 millions in India. Any attempt to establish Jewish dominance would inevitably lead to bloodshed and threaten not merely the prestige but even the integrity and safety of the Empire.

The conflicting claims to dominance are wholly unsustainable on either side whether history, official promises or morals be taken as the standard of justice.

Hope for a peaceful solution of this disturbing problem, consonant with justice, with humani-



tarian succour to great numbers of Jewish sufferers, with great material and social advantage to Palestinian Arabs, and with prosperous development of the country itself (as witness the marvellous transformation under British protection and administration of much of that long-neglected land by Jewish enterprise, capital, industry, capacity, research and creative power) with consequent benefit even to surrounding Arab countries, and what is very important to us in Australia, with the preservation of the Empire's communications, lies in the abandonment by each side of its demands for dominance over the other. Neither side can be expected to submit to dominance, in other words to accept a permanent position of inferiority in numbers or power, and no hope can be reasonably entertained that the dominance of either will be countenanced or peacefully permitted by either. A most serious responsibility therefore for affording a just and acceptable basis for a peaceful and harmonious solution rests primarily on the shoulders of Political Zionism because it is actively pressing for political measures intended to swamp the Arab population. It is a responsibility for, among other things, not imperilling by persistence in wholly unjustifiable aims the excellent opportunity of opening the way towards a humanitarian refuge for unfortunate European Jews who do not desire to return to the scenes of their oppression, or to commence life again in other countries that may be willing to receive them, and who could find shelter in Palestine not only without injury but even with material benefit to the Arab people already there if their friendly acquiescence can be secured.

To persist in its present demands would naturally exasperate all Islam. It may not be too late even now to allay the hostility they have caused and to win the confidence and assent of the Moslem world to the *via media* I have indicated.



It is, however, the theme of all that follows to make transparently clear both to those who press for those demands without full apprehension of their utter lack of sound foundation and to those outside the Jewish faith who may have to judge of the matter the evidence and the arguments that establish their injustice, their fallacies, their dangers to cherished interests, national and personal, of Jews, Christians and Moslems alike.

A just and peaceful solution of the problem is insistently necessary. I sincerely trust it may be found within the terms of Article I of the stated purposes of the United Nations in the San Francisco Charter.

My brochure is accordingly addressed primarily to the movement known as Political Zionism, to the elucidation of the Balfour Declaration, incidentally to religious and cultural Zionism, but not at all to political Zionists personally. It is impersonal and objective only. Individuals find no place in it except to authenticate statements illustrating the not always consistent activities and declarations of the Movement as a Movement.

Many political Zionists, and I believe a considerable proportion of them, are genuinely sincere in their advocacy of the movement. But their sincerity and their ardour and belief in its propriety does not relieve the movement itself as an ideology from the serious objections that attend it. These ardent supporters of the Movement err from various causes, as from lack of knowledge of relevant and inescapable facts, inaccurate judgment, want of appreciation of relative values, or concentration of vision solely on the appalling and sadistic persecution of European Jews by the Nazis and their accomplices to the mistaken exclusion of other material and most serious considerations, thereby obscuring the real character of Political Zionism. Hence arises the inability to see and understand



the injustice, the imminent dangers public and private, the moral obligation towards other peoples and other faiths, and other objections that when the facts are known and properly appraised, are inseparable from the attempt to attain the political aspirations of the movement.

Giving full credit to the proportion who are sincere for their courage in pressing forward demands they consider should be conceded, I am constrained by a sense of duty to the Empire which has done so much for Palestine and the Jewish people and even to the sufferers themselves, as well as to a far wider circle of humanity, to follow the Political Zionists on to the field of public opinion on which they have entered and have sought the support of the world in order to correct the picture they have presented to the United Nations.

The root fallacy of the Movement is that the Jewish people of the world are in solidarity and in the modern sense of the word a Nationality. As a citizen of the British Commonwealth, as an Australian of Jewish faith firmly believing that at the same moment I can no more consistently have, in any relevant sense two nationalities than I can have two religions, as a lover of peace, justice, and humanitarianism and especially as one who owes immeasurable gratitude for the trust that has in various ways been reposed in me I feel bound in the present circumstances not to remain silent but to record objectively why I believe those demands to be unjustifiable.

**"What is Political Zionism?"** the reader may ask. **"Wherein does it differ from other Zionism?"** it may be further asked. The answer is that Political Zionism to which I am irrevocably opposed for reasons which will be found clearly stated, must be sharply distinguished from the religious and cultural Zionism to which I am strongly attached. The first is to make of all Palestine directly or indirectly a "Jewish State"



—or as it is sometimes termed, a “Jewish Commonwealth” —a distinction without a difference. The latter is the Zionism and the only Zionism prefigured by the Balfour Declaration of 1917. This clearly appears from the history and words of that historic Instrument when they are fairly considered. It is established beyond question in my opinion by the authoritative interpretation of the Declaration by the British Government, including Lord Balfour himself, an interpretation deliberately assented to by the Zionist Organisation.

The political interpretation now insisted by Political Zionism is utterly inconsistent with the assurances given to the Arabs in 1918 by the Zionist leader Dr. Weizmann and then accepted by them. It is contrary to the assurance given later to the world by Dr. Weizmann and by Lord Balfour personally on two notable occasions, and is definitely inconsistent with the present Mandate, with the Compact between the British Government and the Zionist Organisation in 1922 and with the repeated statements of British Minister for 23 years as well as with the conclusions of two great Commissions. The Compact which by Zionist acceptance of Mr. Churchill's White Paper of June 19, 1922, rejected the notion of imposing a Jewish nationality on Palestine as a whole and defined the term “a Jewish national home in Palestine” has recently — in June, 1945 — been openly admitted by the British Zionist leader, Dr. Weizmann, as governing the situation. It is, however, given by him a totally wrong interpretation calculated by reason of its political implications to stiffen Arab resistance to any extensive Jewish immigration into Palestine.

These facts appear in this brochure, with complete verification. Nevertheless, the Zionist movement as a whole, passing by these recorded facts, now places its own unwarranted interpretation on the Balfour Declaration, and makes



demands that are arousing the antagonism of the Moslem world of nearly 400 millions, thereby menacing the safety of our Empire, endangering world peace and imperilling some of the most sacred associations of the Jewish, Christian, and Moslem faiths. Besides their inherent injustice to others these demands would, I believe, seriously and detrimentally affect the general position of Jews throughout the world.

What are those demands? Political Zionism demands as I have said that all Palestine shall be constituted, either directly or indirectly, a "Jewish State" or, as it is sometimes phrased, a "Jewish Commonwealth".

**Directly**, by an immediate constitutional declaration that it is a "Jewish State". The most recent open reiteration of that demand by the Movement itself, so far as I am aware, is by the Manifesto recorded in the Melbourne "Herald" of October 22, 1945. That would necessarily, if any meaning at all is to be given to the name "Jewish", require all the inhabitants who desire to be first-class citizens possessing political power to be by origin Jews, or, if now Moslem or Christian by origin, to become Jews. And the power of permitting them to become **Jews in any sense** for that purpose would undemocratically rest in the hands of the Jewish authorities, even if Jews were in a minority.

**Indirectly**, according to the specific demands, either by uncontrolled Jewish immigration as by the Manifesto just mentioned, or by placing in the hands of the Jewish Agency, that is, the Zionist Organisation, the exclusive power, overriding the British Government and every other Government, of controlling immigration into Palestine. By either of these means Jewish immigrants could flood the country, swamp the Moslem and Christian inhabitants, and condemn them to perpetual minority. Then under the camouflage of a nominally democratic Legislature, the State would become entirely Jewish *de facto*.



To bring the position clearly home to the mind of the general reader, one has only to apply such demands to our Australian States. If one State were constitutionally declared Catholic, another Anglican, a third Presbyterian, a fourth Methodist, a fifth Baptist, the sixth Unitarian, and the control of immigration in each case were placed in the hands of the denomination named, could such an arrangement be for a moment tolerated as a democratic condition? Similarly with American States, for instance. And yet Political Zionism, along with its openly formulated demands for a "Jewish State", with startling inconsistency asks political as well as social equality for Jews everywhere outside Palestine, in which necessarily Arab countries are included.

Summarising my objections, on behalf of not only myself, but I am confident of a great though unorganised multitude of my co-religionists in the English-speaking world, the demands of Political Zionism are:—

1. A negation of Democracy, and an attempt to revert to the Church-State of bygone ages.
2. Provocative of anti-Semitism.
3. Unwarranted by the Balfour Declaration, the Mandate, or any other right; contrary to Zionist assurances to Britain and to the Arabs; and in present conditions unjust to other Palestinians politically and to other religions.
4. As regards unrestricted immigration, a discriminatory and an undemocratic camouflage for a **Jewish State**.
5. An obstruction to the consent of the Arabs to the peaceful and prosperous settlement in Palestine of hundreds of thousands of suffering European Jews, the victims of Nazi atrocities; and provocative of Moslem antagonism within and beyond the Empire,



and consequently a danger to its integrity and safety.

6. Inconsistent in demanding on one hand, on a basis of a separate Jewish nationality everywhere Jews are found, Jewish domination in Palestine, and at the same time claiming complete Jewish equality elsewhere than in Palestine, on the basis of a nationality common to citizens of every faith.

**Note.**—The White Paper of 1939 will be specially dealt with.

When, however, full effect is given to the above stated objections by voluntary abandonment or rejection of the extreme demands for dominance, there still remains the true problem of Palestine itself, in which the rights and interests of Jew, Christian and Moslem are internationally concerned and stand in need of adjustment.

That problem divides itself into two branches which rest on distinct grounds. The first is the due implementation of the Balfour Declaration as interpreted in 1918 by Dr. Weizmann in Jerusalem, with the expressed concurrence of the Arab representatives, as agreed to by written compact in 1922 between the British Government and the Zionist Organisation, as personally stated by Lord Balfour in 1922 and 1924, as adopted by the Mandate in which the Balfour Declaration was merged, and as determined by two British Commissions in 1937 and 1938. So implemented a Jewish State created directly or indirectly is impossible.

The second branch rests on the moral duty of the United Nations in the interests of world pacification and relief from suffering so to act consistently with the safety and integrity of our Empire and with moral obligations to others, as to afford refuge to probably some hundreds of thousands of persecuted Jews who may consider Palestine or some other country as their most



suitable home. This requires not only reconsideration of the White Paper of 1939 which only war exigencies, or the menace of war, within perhaps the Empire itself, could possibly justify either as to creation or retention, but also humanitarian consideration by various countries regarding immigration if the San Francisco Charter is to have reality.

Both these phases of the problem are explicitly dealt with.

## CHAPTER I.

### POLITICAL ZIONISM IN ATTEMPTING TO CREATE A CHURCH-STATE IS A NEGATION OF DEMOCRACY.

#### A. Its Central Aims.

As formulated by Zionist demands in Sydney as late as March 26, 1944, and representative of Political Zionism everywhere its central aims are:—

1. All Palestine to be constituted a Jewish State, *alias* Commonwealth.
2. Palestine to be open to **Jewish** immigration **under** the control of the Jewish Agency.
3. The right of **every Jew** who desires to settle in Palestine from his former **place of abode** and to take his possessions with him.

Those demands are substantially, and almost verbally, a repetition of those of the American Conference of Zionists of September, 1943.

The Jewish Agency (Zionist), by a recent memorandum bearing Dr. Weizmann's signature, he being the acknowledged Zionist leader for Britain and Australia, repeats those demands. ("Australian Jewish News," May 19, 1945.)



The Zionist Plenary Conference of July 14, 1945, reaffirmed the demand for a Jewish State in Palestine. ("Hebrew Standard," July 19, 1945.)

That Political Zionism is a purely **political** movement, whatever additional use might be made of Palestine should the movement prove successful, is made clear by the outspoken declaration of Rabbi Silver, the present leader of American Zionists, the largest section of Zionism in the world. At a Zionist meeting at Syracuse, New York, as reported in the Zionist Canadian "Jewish Chronicle" of November 20, 1942, when Nazi persecution and extermination of Jews was filling the world with horror, the report stated:—"He emphasised that ZIONISM IS A POLITICAL AND NOT A PHILANTHROPIC MOVEMENT, and that its aim is to establish Palestine as a political State for the JEWISH PEOPLE".

Observe it is for "the Jewish people", not for the uprooted European Jews, but for **the whole Jewish people**, in which, of course, all Jews in this Empire are included.

Again, at the American Jewish Conference in August and September, 1943, Rabbi Silver took the leading part of moving the resolutions. His speech is described by the special correspondent of the Australian "Zionist" of October 20, 1943, as one of "the highlights of the Conference". He there repeated his former statement. The Conference followed his lead.

Rabbi Silver has been recently recalled to leadership, and was a United States delegate to the Zionist Conference lately held in London. (London "Jewish Chronicle," July 29, 1945; August 3, 1945.) The nature and basis of a general Jewish opposition to Political Zionism, while supporting "practical" Zionism, are well expounded and illustrated in the recent "Universal Jewish Encyclopedia," vol. 10, at pp. 664 ff.



### B. Negation of Democracy.

That these demands are a plain negation of Democracy and of modern nation-building seems to me, in view of the San Francisco Charter, to be beyond controversy.

Irrespective of Arab hostility or even acquiescence, and of other formidable obstacles that stand in the way, there exists **one fundamental objection** that meets us at the threshold.

The attempt to turn back the clock of history nearly 2,000 years and to recreate with the approval of the United Nations pledged to the San Francisco Charter, the "Jewish State", is an attempt to pursue a course of a retrogressive and contradictory character, in fact "an anachronism". Professor Jastrow, in his notable work, "Zionism and the Future of Palestine" (1919), at pp. 20 ff., has demonstrated that until comparatively recent times the inherent feature of political organisation was the close union of Church and State where citizenship, religion, and nationality were linked together. The ancient Jewish State was so formed. To quote an eminent authority: "Citizenship is of course status". In the national sense citizenship in Israel was identified with religion. A member of another race could only become an Israelite by adopting the Israelite religion, so **naturalisation coincides with conversion**. . . . There is added: "The abstract noun 'Yahuduth', Jewishness, contrasted with 'Goyuth', the abstract of 'Goy', Gentile, comes very near our term 'Citizenship' as far as concerns the status of 'Jew'. (Dr. Herzog, in "The Main Institutions of Jewish Law", 1936-1939, published while he was Chief Rabbi of the Free State — Eire.) He is now Chief Rabbi in Palestine.

That this is still the central aim of Political Zionism is placed beyond question by the Report of the **Woodhead (Partition) Commission**, 1938 (Cd. 5854). At page 163, paragraphs 340-342, it is made perfectly clear that Political Zionism



contemplates the resurrection of those ancient tests of full citizenship. It is worth noting that that report is conspicuously left unnoticed by most advocates of Political Zionism. But it is one of the most informative and important documents that exist on the subject, particularly for every British subject of whatsoever faith.

In the paragraphs referred to the following passages, among others, are found:—

“We have received representations from Orthodox Jewry, in which it has been impressed upon us that Orthodox Jews

- (a) regard the STATE and CHURCH as indivisible, and
- (b) consider it fundamental that the constitution of the Jewish State should contain provisions which would ensure for all time the law of the Torah shall be the law of the State, or as it was expressed in one representation which we received, ‘the State shall itself adhere to the cardinal requirements of the Torah’ ”.

After referring (par. 341) to the Iraqi declaration guaranteeing to all inhabitants of the State free exercise of religion, whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or morals, and freedom of conscience and worship, and suggesting similar provisions for Palestine worship, the report in par. 342 says:—“But these guarantees . . . do not satisfy those Orthodox Jews who have urged their views before us. They desire something more. What they desire is that the constitution shall be so drafted as to ensure, not only that the law of the Torah shall prevail, but also that it shall never not prevail. In fact, what they desire is in matters which they consider vital to the Jewish religion, the will of the majority, if it does not coincide with the views of the Orthodox, shall not prevail”.

This was the Orthodox view regarding a “Jewish State” in partition. There is no reason to doubt that in an undivided Palestine as a



"Jewish State" which over and above all humanitarian relief is still insisted on by Political Zionism in perfect accordance with Rabbi Silver ("Australian Jewish News", September 21, 1945), there would be any alteration of view. The "Jewish State" would be the only State in the world where its very name indicated and connoted a particular faith.

### C. The Necessary Implications of a "Jewish State".

If any sensible meaning is to be given to the name "Jewish State" or its synonym "Jewish Commonwealth", and whether the law of the Torah is or is not to be everybody's law, it necessarily connotes that its citizens possessing power must be "Jewish". Obviously no Christian, Moslem or anyone else of non-Jewish faith would be eligible for political citizenship, unless and until converted to the Jewish faith. To speak of that as "democratic" as the Zionist resolutions inconsistently do, is a sheer profanation of the word.

Whether the Movement bases itself on race, religion or history, or all three, in its claim that the Jews of the world are one "Nation" and are "homeless" without Palestine as their exclusive territory, its essence is not the modern ideal of a "state", which to-day democratically unites in one political nationality men and women of various races, religions and histories. Its essence as to Palestine is SEGREGATION and DOMINATION. Inconsistently it claims EQUALITY everywhere else. That inconsistency is not reasonably tolerable. Jews cannot fairly ask of the United Nations equality irrespective of personal religion, and at the same time insist on making Palestine specifically "Jewish". For if that country is, like other countries, to be a State where a man or woman may be an equal citizen politically as well as socially and economically, why stamp it with the exclusive name "Jewish" instead of the name



"Palestine", which it bears in English and Arabic?

Professor Jastrow, in his masterly treatment of the subject, pp. 107 ff., points out at p. 109 that: "Anyone can become a **Palestinian**, as any person can become an American or an Englishman, by obtaining nationalisation papers and swearing allegiance to the principles of the country, but no one can become a **Jew** except by a profession of an adherence to a certain faith. Even the most ardent political Zionist will not deny this contention, and since the Zionists also claim that Zionism is not a religious movement, they surely do not contemplate making converts to Judaism in the proposed Jewish State. How, then, is it possible to organise a State in this democratic age, which by its name sets up a barrier to citizenship that can only be overcome by a religious test?"

At p. 110 the learned author quotes a great leader in Judaism, the late Israel Abrahams: "If it be Jewish, it cannot be a State; if it be a State it cannot be Jewish".

The quotation just referred to has the support of a most distinguished international lawyer. Sir T. E. Holland's authority in this connection would not, I believe, be questioned by any writer of importance. In his *Lectures on International Law* (1933), Lecture VI, after referring to a school of recent writers who put forward the thesis that a new international law is needed substituting nations for States, the "nations" being a natural aggregate of persons, what are called peoples or volker, he expresses his own opinion at p. 57. There he quotes M. Thiers: "If the doctrine of nationalities has any serious meaning, it is this — that all States ought to be composed of **one sole race, of peoples of the same origin, and speaking the same language**. On these conditions, no State would have the right to exist. To desire the application of such a theory in order to realise it we must **retrograde for a**



thousand years". Jastrow, pp. 107 ff., is exactly in line with Professor Holland.

Here as elsewhere, unless otherwise indicated, emphasis in type is mine.

#### **D. Political Exclusion of Non-Jews.**

If Palestine were constitutionally declared a "Jewish State", no Arab, whether Moslem or Christian, no Christian of whatsoever race or denomination, could become a first-class citizen having constitutionally political or civil or even religious rights except by becoming in some way a "Jew". For these he would always be subject to the will of those who constitutionally were Jews.

To repeat what has already been said in the Introduction, if an Australian or American State adopted a Constitution declaring itself Catholic, Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, etc., how plain it would be a negation of Democracy and of the San Francisco Charter.

## **CHAPTER II.**

### **PROVOCATIVE OF ANTI-SEMITISM.**

#### **A. A Policy of Segregation.**

The fundamental and avowed doctrine of Political Zionism is the "homelessness" of Jews **everywhere in the world**, notwithstanding their admission in all democratic countries to political and civil equality before the law. That doctrine is an assertion that the Jews of the world, European, American, African, Australian, whether white, black, or yellow, form in solidarity one united and distinct people. In short, it is an assertion of **SEGREGATION** from all other peoples on the face of the earth, and that their true "home" is Palestine.



It will have been observed that in the "demands" of Political Zionism formulated in Sydney, Jews elsewhere than in Palestine are in what is described as their "**place of abode**". This term must not be attributed to Jews generally.

#### **B. The Rise of Modern Political Zionism.**

Theodor Herzl, who died in 1904, founded in 1896 modern Political Zionism by his pamphlet, "The Jewish State". That pamphlet, of which the revised edition was in 1934 published by the Zionist Organisation in London, and reproduced by it in Sydney, is still nominally the Koran of the Movement, as its author is still nominally its Prophet. It say "nominally" because, as the Movement has developed today, there is an essential departure in principle from the clear-cut plan that Herzl devised.

His plan was to completely transplant the Jewish people to a Jewish State and thereby segregate them from the Gentiles.

To condense his plan in as few words as possible it was this. In 1895, having in the previous year reported for a Viennese journal the Dreyfus trial, he was convinced by that proceeding and the ill-feeling that was exhibited in France, by the Tsarist Russia pogroms, by the persecutions in Roumania, Germany, Austria, and elsewhere, that anti-Semitism was ineradicable and that emancipation where that was accorded only would aggravate it.

His remedy therefore was for **the whole Jewish people of the earth once more an Exodus** to some place they could call their own.

In the first place it was for **the whole Jewish people**, the poor, the middle classes, the prosperous, the wealthy, from every land, to the "Jewish State". In the next place, **where** that State should be was a matter of secondary importance so long as it could accommodate the new Jewish nation, and was held by the Jews in sovereignty. It might be in either Argentina or in Palestine. He preferred Palestine if the Sultan of Turkey,



whose dominion it then was, would grant it. He preferred Palestine because from its historic associations it was more attractive to the Jewish people. For in his view one thing alone united the Jewish people of the earth. His words were (p. 64):— "**WE ARE BOUND TOGETHER ONLY BY THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS**". This in full accord with the very distinct statement by Dr. Adler, then Chief Rabbi (see "Apella" at pp. 45 ff.), and with the quotations by Dr. Hertz (the late Chief Rabbi), from "Saadyah Gaon", and Dr. Schechter, in his "Jewish Thoughts", 1940 edition, p. 107.

By Herzl's plan their "transmigration", as he termed it, to the Jewish State, wherever it should be, was to proceed gradually for all Jews who supported the idea of a Jewish State. Lawyers, doctors, technicians, business men, as he said, were included.

Herzl preached **SEGREGATION** on the largest scale. He acknowledged that as it was a voluntary movement there would be dissentients. Caustically he said (pp. 27, 28):—"Dissentients must remember that **allegiance or opposition** is entirely voluntary. **He who will not come with us may remain behind.** Let all who are willing to join us **FALL IN BEHIND OUR BANNER**, and fight for our cause with voice and pen and **DEED**". It was to be full "allegiance" to the doors of Palestine, or opposition.

The present phase of Political Zionism upholds the banner so far as it inscribes the words "the Jewish State", and connotes transmigration of **SOME** of the Jewish people. But it shrinks, as Herzl predicted some would do, from "following the banner" where Jews, to quote his words, "feel comfortable". There are some who follow the banner up to a point and then leave it. That is quite in accordance with present-day Political Zionism. Herzl's plan has been altered so that the choice is not, as he declared, between "allegiance" and "opposition", but between



"partial allegiance" and "opposition". It now permits partial segregation. It countenances the segregation of a Church-State called a "Jewish State" from all Gentile States. It sanctions those who "feel comfortable" to prefer the example of Orpah to that of Ruth. Ruth followed Naomi the whole way and Orpah went part of the way, but turned back to dwell in Moab. Jastrow terms them "Zionists by proxy". The same idea is expressed more mildly but quite as effectively by Professor Brodetsky, himself an ardent Zionist, in Mr. Paul Goodman's book, "The Jewish National Home", 1917-1942 (p. 259). He says: **"The best Zionist is obviously he who aims at his own settlement in Palestine"**.

But unlike Ruth, even the distance they go, is in my firm opinion a mistaken undertaking. It countenances segregation, or isolation in the language of to-day, even though it be of **others**, in the name of Jewish solidarity, not merely of religion but of so-called nationality. And this in addition to other objections that have been mentioned. I cannot help adding, it is not Herzlian.

**C. Herzl's Admission as to Anti-Semitism.**

At p. 17 he candidly admits:—"It might reasonably be objected that I am giving a handle to anti-Semitism when I say we are a people—one people, that I am hindering the assimilation of Jews where it is about to be consummated, and endangering it where it is an accomplished fact in so far as it is possible for a solitary writer to hinder or endanger anything".

**D. What he did not foresee.**

He did not foresee that Russia would turn from the country of oppression and persecution of Jews simply because they were Jews, to a country, after the Tsarist regime, where Jews are treated on a basis of equality, where Jews might rise to positions of honour and distinction on a level with their fellow-citizens, a country that while forbidding Political Zionism as detracting from the perfect allegiance it demands from all its



citizens, would enact a law making anti-Semitism a crime. He did not foresee that the outcome of the second World War would be an international recognition of the freedom of religion and worship, and a declaration of "universal respect for . . . human rights and fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion".

Nor did he foresee that the events of the last 40 years would make his scheme unnecessary, unjust, and open to the objections that have been summarised in the Introduction, including especially for the moment its provocation to anti-Semitism.

The testimony of two distinguished and representative men, one of the Christian, the other of the Jewish faith, will suffice to elucidate the proposition with which this section is concerned.

#### E. The Earl of Listowel.

This eminent statesman, now Postmaster-General in the Atlee Ministry, in the course of a speech in the House of Lords, in memorable words warned Political Zionism of the danger of provoking anti-Semitism. He said:—"Curiously enough—it does not seem to have been very frequently pointed out—anti-Semitism and Jewish Nationalism have a certain point in common. Both regard the Jews as a separate people from the Gentiles, and as strangers and aliens in whatever country they may have settled, over however long a period of time. They each have therefore the effect, though not of course so strongly in the case of Jewish Nationalism, of **encouraging that unfair discrimination between Jews and non-Jews** in social life which one hopes will disappear as completely as the artificial barrier which for many centuries divided Catholics and Protestants".

It is only just to the noble earl to recognise the kindness which runs as a thread throughout his speech.



**F. Dr. Julian Morgenstern.**

Dr. Morgenstern is a Rabbi, B.A., Ph.D., and LL.D. He is an acknowledged scholar, a Jewish researcher, and the author of several works of ancient character and of Biblical treatises. He is the Principal of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, and he delivered a notable address at the opening of the Redfern Jewish Theological Seminary's Academical Year. That address may be read in the "Australian Jewish News" for December 24, 1943. He traced the progress of the old Zionistic hope and programme of Judaism for over 1,800 years to what he termed accurately "The complete reversion from the free and almost unrestrained UNIVERSALISM in Judaism of the first two-thirds of the 19th century to a NATIONALISM, PARTICULARISM, AND ISOLATIONISM in some respects more extreme than the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah".

Then referring to present-day Zionism he says: "It has run the entire gamut of RACIAL NATIONALISM from the, as we now see, very modest hope of restoration of Palestine as the centre of a new, positive, and intensive Jewish cultural life to the extreme theory of JEWISH NATIONALISM **practically identical with NAZIST AND FASCIST THEORY**, which holds that the bonds of Jewish racial nationalism are eternally indissoluble, that there can be ever **ONLY ONE Jewish HOMELAND, ONLY ONE LAND IN WHICH THE JEW CAN EVER FEEL HIMSELF COMPLETELY AT HOME**, that eternally he is a member of the Jewish racial nation, however that term may be defined, that he resides among the nations, as at present, only as a **temporary sojourner**, that he is in Diaspora, in 'Galut', in EXILE, and that Israel's redemption from the sad fate of the last 1,500 or even the last 2,500 years will be only when it will be restored to the role of completely and predominantly **JEWISH INDEPENDENT STATEHOOD IN PALESTINE**, in whatever form and



however achieved this Statehood may take, Commonwealth, Republic, or Dominion”.

He continues: “The fact incontestably established by history still confronts us with brazen truth, that the true genius and destiny of Israel find expression **ONLY IN ITS ROLE AS A RELIGIOUS PEOPLE**”. In this, as has been seen, he is in accord with Herzl.

#### **G. Official Statement Regarding Political Zionism.**

In 1941 there came to Australia Dr. Michael Traub, the Official Delegate of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. He frankly stated the principles of Political Zionism at meetings of adults and of Jewish youth. His addresses confirm the opinions of Lord Listowel and Rabbi Morgenstern. See, for instance, the Sydney “Hebrew Standard” of November 27, 1941.

I wish emphatically to say with confidence that the doctrines enunciated by Dr. Traub, the delegate of the Jewish Agency abroad, are **not** the sentiments of the majority of Australian Jews. The majority would agree with what Professor Jastrow has said about a “Divided Allegiance”.

#### **H. A “Divided Allegiance”.**

The reasoning of Professor Jastrow at p. 120 of his work already mentioned, is as follows:—  
“Any **political** interest in a Jewish State established elsewhere would have a taint of hyphenation or of divided allegiance. I do not speak here from the point of view of policy, nor have I in mind the fear of arousing a suspicion of hyphenation, but from the feeling which every 100 per cent. American, Englishman, or Frenchman would naturally and spontaneously harbour that beyond a sentimental and historical interest in any other country but his own, whether because he formerly belonged to that country, or had associations with it that attached him to it. **He must not yield to the temptation to look upon such country as a kind of second home. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO BELONG TO TWO COUNTRIES,** and if one



makes the effort **complete attachment to one must necessarily be impaired**".

The learned author then quotes Felix Adler, an American, as saying:—"Allegiance must be perfect — cannot be divided; either a Palestinian or an American".

Under Article 4 of the existing Palestine Mandate: "The Zionist Organisation, so long as its organisation and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency". The "demands" practically require the Government of Palestine as to immigration, which will control its political future to be placed in the hands of the Zionist Organisation. If the Australian Government, for instance, representing all Australians, take one view regarding the peril of the Empire or to Australia specifically, and the Zionist Organisation, including members in Australia, take an opposite view, would there not be a "divided allegiance" as Jastrow has explained it? Australian Jews who were members of that organisation might in that case find themselves in a serious dilemma.

### CHAPTER III.

**DEMANDS OF POLITICAL ZIONISM ARE UNWARRANTED BY THE MANDATE, THE BALFOUR DECLARATION, OR ANY OTHER RIGHT, ARE CONTRARY TO ZIONIST ASSURANCES TO BRITAIN AND THE ARABS, AND IN PRESENT CONDITIONS UNJUST TO OTHER PALESTINIANS POLITICALLY AND TO OTHER RELIGIONS.**

#### **A. Illegal under the Mandate.**

So long as the present Palestine Mandate remains unaltered the British Government would have no legal power to concede the demands made



by Political Zionism. That is really incontestable.

The Mandate is the supreme constitutional law of Palestine. No legislation, and no administrative action inconsistent with its provisions would be upheld in a court of law.

Assuming the invalidity from a legal point of view of the provision in the White Paper of 1939 creating a bar after five years of Jewish immigration except with the consent of the Arabs — a question to be considered later — the demands here dealt with are infinitely worse. The White Paper bar had at least the excuse of the maxim *salus populi suprema lex* and the avoidance of a ghastly orgy of bloodshed, as will be shown. The demands in question, however, on the contrary are provocative of bloodshed as well as being hopelessly unlawful.

In the **Jerusalem Jaffa** case (1926 Appeal Cases 321) the Privy Council, speaking of Article 2 of the Mandate, said "the purpose of the Article is that in fulfilling the duty which is incumbent upon every Government to safeguard the rights from time to time belonging to the inhabitants of the territory **the Mandatory shall not discriminate in favour of any one religion or race**".

Article 6 deals with Jewish immigration. It requires the Administration of Palestine — that is the Government itself acting for His Majesty the King and not one of the rival religions or races — to provide for this. First of all the Article imposes a condition precedent. It is that of "**Ensuring** that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced". With that condition in mind the Government "shall facilitate Jewish immigration **UNDER SUITABLE CONDITIONS** and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish Agency **referred to in Article 4**, close settlement by Jews on the land, etc."

It is plain that the King cannot surrender to the Jewish Agency the trust reposed in him by



the Mandate. Nor can Jewish immigration be lawfully facilitated except subject to the expressed condition of **ensuring** the rights and position of the other sections of the population, Moslem and Christian.

The Jewish Agency mentioned is the Zionist Organisation (Art. 4).

The British Government has rightly obtained the consent of the United States to share some responsibility in this respect for the consequences are momentous.

#### **B. The Responsibility of Political Zionism.**

The demands of Political Zionism for Jewish domination in Palestine, for condemning Christian and Moslem population to a perpetual minority, to submit to such measure of rights as the Jewish majority, plainly **voting as Jews** (and not as Palestinians, irrespective of race or religion, on an equal constitutional footing), and therefore not on grounds of common nationhood, are a standing barrier to peace and justice in Palestine.

The Mandate prescribes "no discrimination" between the inhabitants on the ground of race or religion. Both Arabs and Jews sin against that in their unfounded claims for domination. By all means the Arab claim for dominance should be disallowed. But by all means also let Political Zionism within our Empire renounce its perilous and unfounded claim for dominance in Palestine, for the sake of our Empire, for the sake of peace, for the sake of the sacred associations that Palestine holds for three religions, for the sake of truth and justice, for the sake of the humanitarian object of succouring large numbers of suffering Jews.

#### **C. The Mandate disregarded by Political Zionism.**

Although the Mandate is the trust deed by which the British Government is guided, and the rival parties — Jew and Arab — must be bound so long as it lasts, it is seldom referred to by the enthusiasts of Political Zionism. That is for



the obvious reasons already appearing. Generally the Mandate is silently passed by and the Balfour Declaration is called in aid to support by a forced and long abandoned interpretation the claims and demands that have been hereinbefore particularised as the extreme demands of the Movement.

This use of the Balfour Declaration is constantly made notwithstanding, as Mr. Hyamson truly says in "**Palestine: a Policy**," p. 130:—"The Mandate in effect **superseded** the Balfour Declaration, of which it was not only an elaboration but also to some extent an **interpretation**. It also had behind it a **far greater moral and legal force**".

As however it is often paraded before the world as if it stood as the unqualified Charter of Political Zionism, uninterpreted and untouched by the assurances to the Arab population, and by the trusts created and imposed on the British Government for the protection of the sacred associations of three faiths, it is in the highest degree desirable that its history and its agreed interpretation prior to its incorporation in the Mandate should be clearly stated.

#### **D. A Modern Title Necessary.**

Political Zionism in some quarters, as at a Melbourne Jewish gathering (see Melbourne "Jewish News", Oct. 19, 1945), feeling the pressure of the history and agreed interpretation of the Declaration, falls back on the statement: "The Bible is our Mandate". Britain is put aside, 2,000 years of history are treated as non-existent, the world events of Christianity and Islam, and what Palestine means to those great religions regarded as naught, or at best only secondary, and ancient prophecies long ago fulfilled brought into action as if of yesterday and held up as the complete warrant for shutting the eyes to all that has happened and all the rights that have accrued during twenty centuries. Without stopping to state in detail the obvious inapplicability of such a claim, it is useful in passing to point



out two necessary consequences of making the Bible the Mandate, as is sometimes asserted. It does by necessary inclusion of such important portions of the Bible as Chapters 17-20 of Leviticus, support the views of the Orthodox Jewish representatives referred to in the Woodhead Commission report, that all inhabitants of Palestine in a Jewish State, of whatever race or faith, would be under an obligation to obey the Mosaic Law. Next, as one part of the Bible is as authoritative as another, the claim, if good at all, includes by Chapter 1 vv. 2 to 5 of Joshua not merely Palestine, but Trans-Jordania, Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq.

But suppose such a statement to be eagerly accepted by an enthusiastic Zionist Jewish audience, what ground is there for hoping that it would satisfy the Moslem or the Christian world?

As for the Moslems, they would manifestly reject it. The Koran, not Leviticus, is their guide. The Dome of the Rock is too sacred to them to be surrendered without a sanguinary struggle to Jewish control. And as for Trans-Jordania, Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq, it passes imagination and would more than all else exasperate the Arabs.

The Bible of the Christian world does not stop at the Old Testament. The Christian world would never forget the teaching of Jesus to give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's. Political sovereignty of Palestine to be sought by force was then as it is to-day one thing: personal religion with peaceful citizenship was and is another. The intransigent Zealots of that day disregarded his wisdom, defied the Roman Empire, and destroyed Jerusalem. There are some Political Zionists in the world to-day who, like the Bourbons, learn nothing and forget nothing. Their feet are in the twentieth century, their heads are in the first.



There is a sad and pressing need to save the remnant of European Israel. There is, I believe, a peaceful and at the same time a just way open to do it. But Political Zionism is not that way.

We must remember that Mr. Churchill, on November 17, 1944, when speaking on the subject of Lord Moyne's assassination, and mentioning the Stern Gang, added the necessity of suppressing also "the larger but hardly less dangerous Irgun Zvai Leumi" (National Army) which we see from the Press numbers about 80,000 armed with modern weapons. A Jewish spokesman in Palestine asserts that the recent bombing outrages are the work of that powerful organisation. (The "Age" and "Argus", December 28, 1945.)

We have to remember, too, what Colonel Stanley, Colonial Secretary in Mr. Churchill's Government, stated. He said that Britain was glad to see Palestine as a sanctuary where unfortunate Jews might find refuge. He added: **"However, the rights of the Arabs for whom Palestine has been their country for many centuries must also be recognised"**. (Melbourne "Jewish News", Jan. 26, 1945.) The Melbourne "Jewish Herald" of the same date adds the words: **"and respected"**.

Impartial observers are in agreement with Colonel Stanley. It is sufficient to cite one as it is a representative opinion. The special correspondent of "The Times" (December 4, 1943), then lately in Jerusalem, concluded his despatch with these words: "Palestine belongs as much to the Arabs as to the Jews".

The way of a just and humanitarian peace and refuge is, I believe, still open if Political Zionism will renounce its aim of Jewish domination. As evidence of that I quote from the "Zionist" of September, 1945, p. 17. "Jaffa.—A conference of the Arab Socialist Workers' Union held here issued a manifesto declaring that there is sufficient room in Palestine for both Arabs and Jews". So far the cable does not say the respective



numbers, but there is added what is extremely valuable as a quotation from the manifesto:—  
“If the country is properly developed, both peoples can live here in peace and a Jewish National Home can be built in co-operation with Arab workers ON THE BASIS OF EQUALITY IN A COMMON HOMELAND”.

There is the olive branch. Will Zionists accept it?

The “Bible” will not suffice for the offered co-operation. We must examine the “Modern Title” of the Declaration.

#### E. History of the Balfour Declaration.

The history of the Declaration can well begin by reference to the Seventh Jewish Congress in 1911. There, states Dr. Gottheil, the noted Zionist, in his work, “Zionism” (1914), at p. 154, Professor Warburg said:—“Their right to the land by reason of their having possessed it 2,000 years ago is **not a sufficient claim**. They must create a **modern title** which would consist in the fact that Palestine depended economically upon the Jews owing its progress to Jewish initiative and resources”. He was founder and chairman of the Palestine Commission, and in 1914, the date of Dr. Gottheil’s work, we are told that the Commission guided the Zionist movement (p. 153).

Dr. Warburg’s statement is in line with Herzl’s plan for securing a modern grant for Jewish settlement somewhere, preferably in Palestine.

#### F. Negotiations with British Government.

In “The Truth about the Peace Treaties” (Lloyd George, 1918) are some important historical statements. The author was Prime Minister, and Mr. (afterwards Earl Balfour) and Mr. Churchill were Ministers.

At p. 1141 it is stated:—“In January, 1916, the British Government policy in regard to Palestine Holy Places and Zionist colonisation” (note the word “colonisation”; it is not “State”) “was officially communicated to Hussein” (he was the



Arab leader), "that so far as Palestine is concerned we are **determined that no people shall be subjected to another**". That was a distinct pledge to both Arabs and Jews that Palestine should not be either a Moslem or a Jewish State.

Again speaking of the "Return of Jews to Palestine"—note it refers not to "uprooted" Jews but Jews anywhere—it is stated "as this Government **views with favour** the realisation of this **aspiration**, His Majesty's Government are determined that **in so far as is compatible with the freedom of the existing population, both economic and political**, no obstacle should be put in the way of the realisation of this ideal.

Mr. Lloyd George goes on to say:—"The Arab leaders did not offer any objection to the declaration so long as the **rights of the Arabs were recognised**."

At p. 1193 Mr. Churchill is reported as saying in 1919, that is two years after the Balfour Declaration:—"We made a pledge that we would not turn the Arab off his land or invade his **political and social rights**".

Mr. Montague, a Jewish member of the Cabinet, said:—"Mr. Balfour's speech guaranteed the right of both".

These extracts show beyond doubt the intention of the Government in making the Declaration. We shall now see whether that intention was carried out by its language, and the agreed meaning of the Instrument.

#### **G. The Balfour Declaration.**

Lord Rothschild, President of the Zionist Organisation, wrote to the British Government a letter in which he asked for "The Reconstitution of Palestine as a National Home".

If that request had been assented to that would so far as Britain was concerned have committed her to regard the **whole** of Palestine as devoted to the purpose of being **reconstituted** as in days of Jewish independence 2,000 or rather 2,500 years ago as a Jewish State, blotting out of the



pages of history all that had since transpired in that country, ignoring the priceless spiritual treasures of other faiths, and casting aside the distinct pledges to the non-Jewish populations already and for centuries established in Palestine.

That request, however, was not acceded to. The widely embracing phrase suggested in Lord Rothschild's letter does not appear in the Declaration. It was replaced by a very different expression. The words chosen were:—"His Majesty's Government view with favour the **establishment in Palestine** of a national home for the **Jewish people**, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of **this object**", then adding these all-important words:—"It being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing **non-Jewish** communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country".

#### H. The Alteration Decisive.

This decisive alteration has been recognised by Professor Norman Bentwich and others. For instance, Sir Ronald Storrs, who was for some time Governor of Jerusalem, says in his "Zionism and Palestine" (Penguin Series at p. 75):—"Herzl's original 'Judenstaat' was indeed absolutely and permanently excluded by the British Government as well as repudiated by Official Zionism".

The Zionist repudiation referred to by Sir Ronald Storrs was part of the Compact deliberately made between the Government and the Zionist Organisation. But it had already been repudiated openly long before by Dr. Weizmann in a very solemn manner. And this repudiation was the sequel to a very sensible attitude on the part of Zionism. A passage from Dr. Gottheil's "Zionism" illustrates this.



### I. Dr. Gottheil.

At p. 126 the following occurs, written in 1914: "It is true that from time to time, some Zionists of more stalwart than sober faith have spoken of a Jewish State fully independent, with all the accompaniments and appanages belonging thereto. But the more sober and deliberate judgment of those who spoke with authority have never gone beyond the borders of reasonableness. The 'Basel Platform' speaks of a **home**" (emphasis the author's) "in which Jewish aspirations may be realised. A **home** (again the author's emphasis) demands security and permanence; and under the aegis of a great and liberal power and with a measurable amount of **autonomy** such a **home** (emphasis the author's) could be more readily procured and preserved than if independence were complete and unrestricted".

It was this idea of a "Home" that was incorporated into the Balfour Declaration, and that has long been established under the Mandate. In "**The Laws of England**" (Volume II, p. 157) we find it stated: "Under regulations of 1927 the Jewish community is organised and recognised **enjoying autonomy** in internal affairs, religious, cultural, and communal, with power to levy rates on its members. It has a Chief Rabbinate and local rabbinical officers, an elected Assembly and General Council elected by the Assembly which represents the Community in relation with the Government". It is added that similar local autonomy exists for Moslems since 1921.

So, Sir Ronald Storrs at p. 118:—"The National Home is beyond question unshakably established. In a note to that page he gives detailed evidence of that fact in a striking quotation.

### J. Dr. Weizmann in 1918.

Professor Norman Bentwich in his "England in Palestine" at p. 27 says that Dr. Weizmann in Jerusalem in 1918, the year after the Balfour Declaration, "denied emphatically the allegation



which was already being spread that the Jews intended to take the political domination of Palestine into their hands at the end of the war, in other words to create a Jewish State".

With still greater detail this statement is corroborated by Sir Ronald Storrs in the work already referred to, "Zionism and Palestine", at p. 47. Sir Ronald, then Military Governor of Jerusalem, arranged a dinner party at which leading men representative of Britain, of Jewish interests, and of the Christian and Moslem faiths, were present. There, condensing what is stated, Dr. Weizmann "let his hearers beware of treacherous insinuations that Zionists were seeking POLITICAL POWER — rather let both progress together until they were ready for a JOINT AUTONOMY". The Mufti of Jerusalem, we were told further, "replied civilly thanking Dr. Weizmann for allaying apprehensions which but for his exposition might have been aroused". The Mufti concluded:—"Our rights are your rights and your duties our duties".

This was the interpretation of the Balfour Declaration by both Zionists and Arabs in 1918. If both had adhered to that interpretation there would be peace and happiness in Palestine to-day. There would be no difficulty in providing refuge for suffering Jews in that country and Britain would not be faced with the serious menace for which Political Zionism and Arab nationalism are jointly responsible.

#### **K. Dr. Weizmann in 1921.**

Professor Bentwich in his latest book, "Judea Lives Again", at pp. 140 ff., tells us that the Zionist Congress of 1921, the first after the granting of the Mandate (but it was before it was finally settled and framed), declared the desire of the Jewish people to live in fraternity with the Arab people and "TO DEVELOP THE HOMELAND COMMON TO BOTH PEOPLES". That was plainly a representation to the world that Zionism did not desire under the forthcoming



Mandate to make any attempt to obtain a Jewish States.

**L. Dr. Weizmann in 1931.**

In an address referred to at p. 141 of the last-mentioned work we are told that Dr. Weizmann said:—"The policy was still that of a BI-NATIONAL PALESTINE IN WHICH BOTH JEWS AND ARABS WOULD BE NEITHER DOMINATING NOR DOMINATED. The Arabs must be made to feel by deed as well as by word that whatever the future numerical relationship of the two nations in Palestine, we on our part contemplate NO POLITICAL DOMINATION."

On the same page it is stated:—"Until 1936 Dr. Weizmann spoke of THE COMMON FATHERLAND of the Arabs and Jews as the ULTIMATE AIM."

The term "Fatherland" there obviously refers to those Arabs and Jews who under Article 6 of the Mandate possessed **Palestinian citizenship** either by birth or acquisition.

**M. The Compact.**

Though in 1920 it had been determined that the Mandate over Palestine should be entrusted to Britain, the Mandate was not issued until 1924. That it should be granted to Britain was recognised as appropriate from Britain's position in the Near East and her undertaking by the Balfour Declaration. Arab fears had been allayed by Dr. Weizmann's assurances to the Arabs in 1918 and 1921.

In 1922 before deciding on the terms of the Mandate it became necessary that a complete understanding between the Government and the Zionist Organisation should be arrived at. The most urgent reasons of Empire security demanded close scrutiny. A peaceful and contented Palestine was then, as it is now, an essential link in Empire communications. Egypt, the Suez Canal, the Indian Ocean, India, Australia, New Zealand, all had to be taken into consideration. It was absolutely necessary to equate promises



to the Jewish people and to the Moslem populations.

The result of anxious discussion at the council table at which we can picture Lord Balfour as Lord President of the Council was embodied in an historic letter of June 3, 1922, addressed by Mr. Churchill for the Government to the Zionist Organisation. It specifically and entirely rejected the then recent demand, utterly inconsistent with other statements by him, that "Palestine should become as Jewish as England is English". As has been pointed out three years before in "Jewish Opinion" for March 1, 1919 (p. 1), "Neither race nor religion makes an Englishman. But religion primarily, and secondarily and in a minor degree race, constitute the Jew".

Mr. Churchill's letter stated explicitly that **"the terms of the Declaration do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish National Home, but that such a Home should be founded in Palestine."**

The letter referred to the Zionist Congress resolution of 1921 already mentioned. It was made clear that "It is contemplated that the status of all citizens of Palestine in the eyes of the law shall be PALESTINIAN and it has NEVER been intended that they, or **any section** of them should possess any other juridical status".

The nature of the "Jewish National Home" is distinguished from a "Jewish State". That will receive attention later.

The letter concluded:—"This then is the INTERPRETATION which His Majesty's Government place upon the Declaration of 1917, and it does **not contain or imply** anything which can cause alarm to the Arab population of Palestine, or disappointment to the Jews".

On June 18 Dr. Weizmann for the Zionist Organisation wrote accepting that interpretation.

On the faith of that Compact the British



Government proceeded with the framing of the Mandate.

It is difficult to understand, in the face of that distinct and unmistakable Compact, the present attitude of the Political Zionist Movement. As Mr. Bentwich says, until 1936 Dr. Weizmann looked upon Palestine as the "common home" of Jews and Arabs there. Indeed, in a work published in 1936, "What Will Happen to the Jews," by Mr. Joseph Leftwich (at p. 121), Dr. Weizmann is referred to as saying in opposition to a "Jewish State":—"What people mean when they talk of a Jewish State in Palestine, I cannot imagine". "We recognise that Palestine is going to be the common homeland of the Jews and Arabs. Palestine could become a Jewish State if it were an uninhabited country. But it is not an uninhabited country". So far Dr. Weizmann, the acknowledged leader of Political Zionism, was in accord with the Compact.

#### **N. The Congressional Resolution of 1922.**

On June 22, 1922, the American Congress passed a resolution perfectly in line with the two letters above-mentioned declaring that they favoured "the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish peoples" and added what is extremely important at the moment to bear in mind:—"It being clearly understood that nothing should be done which may prejudice the civil or religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish Communities in Palestine, and that the Holy Places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine should be adequately protected".

That resolution was also before the nations that granted the Mandate as it stands. It was passed in President Harding's term, and not only supersedes earlier personal anticipations of President Wilson, but is difficult to reconcile with the more recent electioneering planks on Palestine found in the platforms of rival parties in America.



It is in my opinion irreconcilable with the Congressional Resolutions of December, 1945.

**O. Lord Balfour's Personal Interpretation.**

Not only was Lord Balfour, as Minister, a necessary party to Mr. Churchill's letter of June 3, 1922, but on June 21, 1922, he gave expression to his views in a speech in the House of Lords. It was on a discussion upon the proposed Mandate shortly before it was finally approved by the League of Nations. (House of Lords Debates, 1922, Vol. 50). I refer to a passage at column 1011 where speaking of the Mandate Lord Balfour said:—"I cannot imagine any political interests exercised under greater safeguards than the **POLITICAL INTERESTS** of the **ARAB POPULATION** of Palestine".

Again on July 24, 1924, at the closing meeting of the League of Nations after the Mandate was granted and approved, Lord Balfour made what I regard as his final official Declaration as to the position of Palestine, in respect of Arabs and the Jewish National Home. It can be found in his collected "Speeches on Zionism," p. 66, and also in "The Times" of July 25, 1922. He said, *inter alia*:—"I know there have been representatives of the Arab population who think that their interests have not been sufficiently safeguarded. I can most sincerely assure them that the most anxious attention has been paid to their position, and that the last that the British Government have ever desired is that they should be sufferers from injustice because we try to carry out the policy of **PROVIDING A JEWISH HOME IN PALESTINE FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE**. Believe me, the two policies are in no sense antagonistic or inharmonious with each other. I believe that **EVERY LIBERTY** will be preserved to the Arab population".

The conclusiveness of Lord Balfour's assurances cannot for a moment be doubted. I can conceive of no words which could more fully assure the Arabs and the world that the Arabs



would not suffer the injustice of being made the subjects of a "Jewish State". They were assurances that they would not be governed by Jews, that they would not be "swamped" as Mr. Churchill first and Lord Samuel later (House of Lords 1939, Vol. 113, col. 39) phrased it by Jewish immigration, in order that as Dr. Weizmann in his warlike message to the American Conference and adopted by that Conference declared:—"Thereby constituting the Jewish Commonwealth foreshadowed by the Balfour Declaration". Lord Balfour from his grave gives his strict denial to such an assertion.

To attribute to him and through him to the British Government what Political Zionism "demands" in his name is to attribute to him a want of candour that is unthinkable.

#### P. Lord Moyne's Testimony.

One of the most notable and most informative as well as constructive speeches on the subject is that delivered by the late Lord Moyne in the House of Lords on June 8, 1942. It is sad to reflect that to the candid, just and patriotic expression of the situation he owed his untimely death at the hands of members of a group of

Lord Moyne (House of Lords Debates 1941-42, Vol. 123, Col. 196 ff.) said *inter alia*:—"The Zionist claim has raised two burning issues. Firstly, the demand for large-scale immigration into an already overcrowded country, and secondly, racial domination by these newcomers over the original inhabitants".

"In 1922, when the present Prime Minister was Colonial Secretary, he issued a statement on British policy in Palestine **which is very much to the point in regard to the Jewish claim to political domination and the swamping of the Arab population to-day.** Mr. Churchill stated that His Majesty's Government had not at any time contemplated the subordination of the Arabic population, language, or culture in Palestine. Attention was drawn to the fact that the terms of the



Balfour Declaration do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish National Home but that such a Home should be founded in Palestine. It was laid down that immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals. . . .

"It was stated that up to that time immigration had fulfilled these conditions, the number of immigrants since the British occupation having been about 25,000.

"At the end of the last war, the Jewish Community numbered 80,000. It now numbers about 450,000".

(I interpose that according to recent rough estimation the present Jewish population is 600,000 and the Arab number 1,150,000. See Sydney "Daily Mirror", October, 1945.)

Continuing Lord Moyne, he said:—

"Over and over again Commissions and White Papers have expressed the opinion that neither the Mandate nor the Balfour Declaration intended Palestine to be converted into a Jewish State against the will of the Arab population. gangsters whom all responsible Jewry throughout the world disown and execrate.

"The tragedy of the Palestinian question is, as was said by the Royal Commission, that it is a conflict between two rights. When Jerusalem was destroyed, its soil ploughed up in the year 135, the Jews had occupied the country for about 1,300 years. Since the Mahommedan invasion of 632 the Arabs have occupied Palestine for practically the same period." . . . .

" . . . . A far smaller measure of immigration" (than that demanded by Zionist leaders) "led to the Palestine disturbances which lasted from 1936 to 1939, and showed that the Arabs, who had lived and buried their dead for fifty generations in Palestine, will not willingly surrender their land and self-government to the Jews. We



may deplore it, but there is the stark naked fact, and you cannot get away from it by sentimental appeals to the hardship on the Jews" . . . . .

" . . . . . Surely it is time for the Zionists to **abandon** this appeal to force, and to **SEEK A SETTLEMENT WITH THE ARABS BY CONSENT** . . . . If the fear of **JEWISH DOMINATION COULD BE REMOVED** they" (the Arabs) "might indeed welcome the Jewish immigrants with their well-known industry and intelligence and with their capital".

At col. 199 Lord Moyne advocated looking at once "**in all directions**" to find means of re-establishing "these martyrs to Nazi oppression to a new life". A memorable declaration.

#### **Q. Peel Commission.**

Lord Moyne's reference to Commissions and White Papers is amply borne out by evidence. The White Paper of 1922 itself is decisive that Political Zionism is destitute of any rightful claim by reason of the Balfour Declaration, since Mr. Churchill's interpretation on behalf of, *inter alios* Lord Balfour, was accepted. The Commissions referred to were notably the Peel Commission, and the Woodhouse Commission. Seldom if ever is the latter mentioned in Zionistic literature. The former receives very inadequate attention in Zionist propaganda so far as the **Conclusions** of the Commission are concerned. Some of the **evidence** is conspicuously displayed, but the **Judgment** of the Tribunal — to use a legal analogy — is scarcely noticed. It is the considered and reasoned set of conclusions rejecting the Political Zionist claims to which I shall draw attention.

The Peel Commission, a Royal Commission under the chairmanship of the late Lord Peel, was appointed in August, 1936, as a result of disturbances between Jews and Arabs in Palestine earlier in the year. They were required to enquire into the question of grievances and remedies.

Their **General Conclusion** as to the conflicting



claims of Jews and Arabs to dominate is found at p. 375:—"The answer to the question, 'Which of them **in the end** will govern Palestine', must surely be '**NEITHER**'. We do not think any fair-minded statesman would suppose, now that the hope of harmony between the two races has proved untenable, that Britain ought to hand over to Arab rule 400,000" (now say nearly 600,000) "**Jews whose entry into Palestine has for the most part been facilitated by the British Government and approved by the League of Nations; or that IF THE JEWS SHOULD BECOME A MAJORITY, A MILLION OR SO**" (now about 1,150,000) "**OF ARABS SHOULD BE HANDED OVER TO THEIR RULE**".

I would ask seriously in confirmation of that expression of opinion can any fair-minded Australian, or indeed any fair-minded person, find fault with the general conclusion of the Commission?

Their **Specific Conclusions** bear on the question of the Jewish State, the interpretation of the Balfour Declaration, and the Mandate. They are found at pp. 41 and 42 of the Report and are:—

1. "The recognition of Jewish rights was linked with the recognition of Arab rights".

2. "If the Arab claims to Palestine were subject to the rights of others, so were Jewish claims".

3. "To foster Jewish immigration in the hope that it might ultimately lead to the creation of a Jewish majority and the establishment of a Jewish State **with the consent or at least the acquiescence** of the Arabs was one thing. It was quite another thing to contemplate, however remotely, **THE FORCIBLE CONVERSION** of Palestine into a Jewish State **against the will of the Arabs**".

"For that would clearly violate the spirit and intention of the Mandate system. It would mean that national self-determination had been withheld when the Arabs were a majority in Pales-



tine, and only conceded when the Jews were in a majority. It would mean that the Arabs had been denied the opportunity of standing by themselves; that they had in fact after an interval of conflict been **BARTERED ABOUT FROM TURKISH SOVEREIGNTY TO JEWISH SOVEREIGNTY**. It is true that in the light of history Jewish rule over Palestine could not be regarded as foreign rule in the same sense as Turkish, but the international recognition of the Jews to return to their homeland **did not involve the recognition of the right of the Jews to govern the Arabs against their will**".

The concluding words of the preceding sentence, adverse as it is to Political Zionism, omits to notice the fundamental objection to a "Jewish State", namely reversion to the obsolete "Church-State" of a bygone age.

**The remedy proposed** was partition of Palestine into three zones, a Jewish State, an Arab State, and an enclave containing Jerusalem and various Holy Places sacred to three religions and separated from both these States. The scheme has been rejected.

#### **R. Woodhead Commission.**

On January 4, 1938, the British Government appointed a Commission under the chairmanship of Sir John Woodhead. It is called the Partition Commission, since its function was the demarcation of the divisions suggested by the Peel Commission. Notwithstanding the importance of its report, it is remarkable that almost Trappist silence is preserved regarding it by Political Zionism. That report is in Cd. 5854 of 1938.

It gives (p. 15) a short history of the disturbances leading to the Peel Commission, its conclusions, and their effect. It considers the relation of the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine in relation to the Moslem world and also to the Christian world. These are here placed in order.



### 1. The Moslem World.

At p. 77 (par. 167) the Commission states:—  
“The political and religious objections are . . .  
in our opinion fatal to the proposal that any part  
of Jerusalem should be included in the Jewish  
State.”

After reference in par. 167 to the Mosque of Omar as among the most treasured possessions of the Moslem world for many centuries the Commission accepts the assurances of “persons well qualified to express an opinion that to include a part of Jerusalem with the Jewish State” would inevitably lead to disorders of the most serious kind”.

I may interpose the historical fact that the Mosque of Omar — the Dome of the Rock — has been in Moslem hands twice as long as Jerusalem was possessed by Jews as an independent nation.

Substantial reasons are given for not disregarding the Arab refusal to entrust the safety of their sacred places to a Jewish authority.

### 2. The Christian World.

The effect of including Jerusalem in a Jewish State in the conditions prevailing in Palestine is graphically and to my mind touchingly as well as convincingly told by the Commission. At par. 172 it is said:—“But it is not only Moslem opinion which is to be considered in this matter. Jerusalem is also sacred to the Christian faith, and not only the Old City within which stands the Church of the Holy Sepulchre itself and the Way of the Cross, but also many places in the surrounding area, such as the Mount of Olives, and the Sanctuary of the Ascension, the Garden of Gethsemane, Bethlehem, and the Church of the Nativity, the village of Bethany, the road to Emmaus, all places hallowed to the Christian by the most precious associations. It may be that many Christians, especially in this country, sympathise with the passionate longing of the Jews for Jerusalem and would be willing to see at least that part of the city which includes the



modern suburb and the Hebrew University incorporated in the Jewish State, if that could be done by agreement and good will.

"But we are convinced that the dominant desire of the whole body of Christians would be to **preserve the peace of Jerusalem** and safeguard the Holy City from any change which threatened to provoke hatred and bloodshed within its walls or in their neighbourhood. With this in mind, we believe that **CHRISTIAN OPINION THROUGHOUT THE WORLD**, realising that such a step would provoke resentment and disorder, **WOULD BE DEEPLY GRIEVED** by a proposal to entrust a part of the city precincts to the control of the Jewish Community".

How much more, the whole city, and the whole country!

In par. 174 the Commission declares:—"The **political and religious objections to the Jewish claim**" (this for Jerusalem) "**must be held to be decisive**". They add:—"We feel convinced that the unique character of Jerusalem as the object of the affection and veneration of three of the great religions of mankind must be recognised by **ITS RETENTION IN TRUST FOR THE WORLD UNDER MANDATORY GOVERNMENT**".

#### **The Background of the Report.**

The Commission (page 19, par. 29) sets out an account of the disorders that had already arisen and the danger to which Bethlehem and other sacred places were exposed.

I am confident that I express the sentiments of the majority of my Jewish brethren in agreeing with the sympathetically frank conclusions of the Commission.

The disorders are recurring, and it is plain to me that until Political Zionism abandons its extreme claims there will be no peace in Palestine.



## CHAPTER IV.

### THE ZIONIST DEMAND FOR UNRESTRICTED IMMIGRATION OF JEWS A DISCRIMINATORY AND UNDEMOCRATIC CAMOUFLAGE FOR A JEWISH STATE.

#### A. The American Zionist Conference of September, 1943.

In September, 1943, an American Jewish Conference met. One of its resolutions was "Unrestricted Jewish Immigration into Palestine". It also resolved that all immigration should be controlled by the Jewish Agency, that is, by the Zionist Organisation.

The Conference was organised by Zionists. There were really no democratic elections of the delegates by the masses. (See the admission of this fact in the "Australian Jewish Forum", December, 1943, Mr. Shemberg's letter from Toronto.) The affirmative vote was representative of only a minority of American Jewry. (See also the "South Africa Jewish Chronicle" of September 10, 1943.)

Rabbi Silver, the present leader of American Zionism, was, as stated in the Melbourne "Zionist" of October 29, 1943, one of the "highlights" of the Conference. He delivered a "powerful oration". His address is conveniently to be read in "New Palestine" for September, 1943. The following extracts lay bare the heart of Political Zionism in relation to the claim for "Unrestricted Immigration". The Rabbi said:—

1. "On the basis of sheer philanthropy of satisfying pressing immigration needs, PALESTINE HAS ALREADY DONE ITS FULL SHARE FOR JEWISH REFUGEES. It has taken in more than one-half of the total Jewish refugees of the world; and the Palestine Arabs, their sympathisers in England and here, have been quick to point out that PALESTINE HAS ALREADY DONE ALL THAT CAN BE EXPECTED FROM A SMALL COUNTRY, and far



more than most of the larger countries have done”.

2. “It is because Palestine is the Jewish Homeland that we have the right to insist upon UNRESTRICTED IMMIGRATION. It is on the NATIONAL IDEA that the upbuilding of Palestine as a place of largescale Jewish immigration has always rested and CAN ALONE CONTINUE TO REST. Our right to immigration in the last analysis is predicted upon the right to build the JEWISH COMMONWEALTH IN PALESTINE”. He added:—“They are interlinked and inseparable”.

Rabbi Silver was chosen as the chief spokesman for his well-known views. The Canadian “Jewish Chronicle” of November 29, 1942, states that at the Zionist meeting at Syracuse, New York, he “voiced the demand that Palestine be placed under INTERNATIONAL CONTROL to enable the rapid establishment of a JEWISH MAJORITY or the immediate establishment of a COMMONWEALTH based on the possibility of a Jewish majority”.

Further:—“The interference of the British Colonial Office with the mandatory system under which Palestine is governed must terminate”.

The Report added:—“Dr. Silver emphasised that ZIONISM IS A POLITICAL AND NOT A PHILANTHROPIC MOVEMENT, and that its aim is to establish Palestine as a political State for the Jewish people”.

There we see Political Zionism unmasked.



## CHAPTER V.

### POLITICAL ZIONISM AN OBSTRUCTION TO ARAB CONCILIATION, TO THE PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF JEWS IN PALESTINE, AND PROVOCATIVE OF MOSLEM ANTAGONISM WITHIN AND BEYOND THE EMPIRE, AND CONSEQUENTLY A DANGER TO ITS INTEGRITY AND SAFETY.

#### A. Dr. Weizmann's Later Attitude.

Political Zionism regards Dr. Weizmann as the leader *par excellence* of the Movement. Of late years his utterances are in marked contrast with the earlier assurances to the British Government and to the Arabs that I have already quoted from former years.

1. In "The Canadian Jewish Chronicle" of May 15, 1942, Dr. Weizmann is reported to have at the Zionist gathering held at the Biltmore Hotel, New York, paraphrased Winston Churchill by saying:—"Give us the political conditions and we will finish the job".. If language of that charter is given publicity, it cannot be matter for surprise that Arab antagonism is aroused.

2. "The New York Times" of August 31, 1943, records that Dr. Weizmann cabled to the American Conference in that month urging the American Conference to claim what he termed "their full status as free men, and the right to return to Palestine and to take their fate into their own hands, THEREBY ESTABLISHING THE JEWISH COMMONWEALTH foreshadowed by the Balfour Declaration". The cable ended thus:—"This time solemn declarations are not enough".

#### B. An Obstruction to Arab Conciliation.

The Peel Commission's Report above quoted irresistibly states the natural reaction of the Arabs for cogent reasons against the now undisguised attempt to coerce Britain into permitting Jewish political domination in Palestine.



The name "Jewish State" carries with it religious domination also. A block Jewish vote, if once the Jewish majority is established, means domination in all respects.

I repeat the valuable confirmation of this fact of obstruction, contained in the "Zionist" of Melbourne (September, 1945, at p. 17), appears:—"If the country is properly developed both peoples can live here in peace, and a Jewish National Home can be built in co-operation with Arab workers on the basis of EQUALITY IN A COMMON HOMELAND".

**There, I repeat, is the OLIVE BRANCH. Will POLITICAL ZIONISM be wise in time?** It is only what Dr. Weizmann as reported gave as Zionist pledges for 1918 to 1931 and even to 1936.

#### **C. Danger to the Peace and Integrity of our Empire.**

The daily Press contains repeated evidence of this peril. The Moslem world will not permit without a struggle the control of their sacred places in Palestine to pass under Jewish control; nor will it allow silently Jewish domination over the persons and property of the Arab population there.

I appeal to all of Jewish faith not to stir fire with a sword.

#### **D. The Remedy.**

If but Political Zionism — "Jewish State" and its alias "Unrestricted Jewish Immigration" — were renounced and the olive branch accepted, then an extensive Jewish immigration of Palestine lovers could no doubt be assented to, with guarantees that there should be no domination by Jew or Arab. Whatever the relative population might be, there could, as in the Australian and American Senate, be parity of power. Britain would be a just arbiter in case of difference and a powerful protector.



The only certain bar to this can be the preference of Political Zionistic aspirations in a changed and different world from that of 2,000 years ago to modern democratic institutions and humanitarian considerations. Which will prevail?



## CHAPTER VI.

**INCONSISTENCY OF DEMANDING ON ONE HAND ON A BASIS OF A SEPARATE JEWISH NATIONALITY FOR JEWS WHEREVER THEY ARE FOUND, A JEWISH STATE IN PALESTINE WITH JEWISH DOMINATION THERE, AND ON THE OTHER HAND OF CLAIMING COMPLETE JEWISH EQUALITY IN EVERY OTHER COUNTRY ON THE BASIS OF A NATIONALITY COMMON TO THE CITIZENS OF EACH COUNTRY IRRESPECTIVE OF THEIR INDIVIDUAL RELIGIOUS FAITH.**

This aspect has been sufficiently dealt with, and it would be burning daylight to pursue further so self-evident a proposition except to emphasise the danger of permitting the same result to be indirectly attained by forcing a discriminatory preference of unrestricted immigration to all Jews from any part of the world as a right simply because they are Jews. That is as indefensible as discrimination against them simply because they are Jews.

It also confuses the meaning of the word "Nationality", rests on a false basis, and obscures the real virtue of the humanitarianism which should prompt the regulation of Jewish immigration into Palestine.



## CHAPTER VII.

### THE WHITE PAPER OF 1939.

Properly with justice to Britain to understand the much debated White Paper of 1939, which the British Government in the interests of justice is not willing, and in those of public safety does not even now dare entirely to abrogate, but only as far as consistent with those supreme considerations is willing to ameliorate in present circumstances (see the "Age", November 1, 1945), we have to take into account several important factors. These include its background, the circumstances of its adoption, its provisions, its relation to the world position of to-day, the task of reconsidering how far its provisions should in the interests of justice and humanity be modified, and the possibility of Jewish immigration elsewhere than in Palestine.

A mere political blanket resolution disregarding such considerations can never satisfy the independent conscience of an informed enquirer. It may inflame, it can never salve the open wound.

This White Paper of 1939 will probably be the battleground on which the fate of Palestine, and the future welfare of far beyond it will depend. Each of the foregoing factors deserves a brief notice.

1. **The Background** of the White Paper has already to some extent been made evident by what has been said regarding the disorders leading to the Peel Commission, the Woodhead Commission, and the reports of those Commissions.

It need only be added, as was truly stated in the Sydney "Hebrew Standard" of January 21, 1938, speaking a little over twelve months before the White Paper was formulated and when the situation was all too plainly perilous:—"Palestine is a cauldron where peace is maintained at the point of the bayonet".



It is unfortunately common knowledge that German propaganda was then active for world domination and was extended to create disaffection among the Arabs regarding Palestine. Unfortunately also the statement just quoted from the "Hebrew Standard" of 1938 could be repeated to-day. (See Melbourne "Herald", December 27, 1945; "Age" and "Argus", December 28, 1945.)

2. **The Circumstances of its Adoption** can be found succinctly and impartially stated by Sir Ronald Storrs, formerly Governor of Jerusalem, in his "Zionism and Palestine" (Penguin), at pp. 127-128. This I abridge. Zionist illegal immigration was then proceeding. Gestapo agents arrived along with the unfortunate refugees. The illegal immigration went on notwithstanding the fact that under the Mandate the Jewish population had in a little over 20 years multiplied tenfold, from 50,000 to 500,000.

After endeavours to secure agreement between Arabs and Jews the White Paper was issued. It placed restrictions on Jewish immigration into Palestine and on land transactions. These will presently be mentioned. Protests against restrictions came in a steady stream from the United States, as Sir Ronald Storrs says, in a Presidential-election year — much as now — looking slightly ahead.

The House of Commons, by a large majority, rejected a censure vote upon the White Paper. Sir Ronald sums up the position in these words: "It was time. We could not afford another 1936 in 1940. The allegiance of our Near-Eastern Allies and the good relationship of friendly neutrals had already been tested by events in Palestine and had hitherto not been found wanting. The rulers of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq were no less embarrassed by the complaints of their Palestinian co-religionists than were our loyal Moslem fellow-subjects of India. This was no moment to strain them further.



To reintroduce mistrust by even appearing to wobble upon this decision would have been to disconcert and unsettle the growing confidence of Palestine moderates; to play gratuitously into the hands of the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem and his satellites, in cricket parlance to offer Dr. Goebbels a half volley, to which he would open his shoulders and which he could have hardly have failed to lift over the pavilion".

Sir Ronald adds:—"Zionists were from their point of view doubtless justified in registering their protest, for in Palestine unprotected decisions were apt to be registered as accepted and the case to have gone by default".

I interpose the reminder that this refers only to the new restrictions above mentioned. Even so the author says:—"But the responsible mandatory Government is not only justified, but" (speaking in 1940), "is BOUND in duty and in prudence to hold fast, and to see that BOTH HALVES OF THE MANDATE ARE FAITHFULLY AND PRACTICALLY MAINTAINED". That is what the present British Government has announced as its intention; it is what Political Zionism and the resolutions of the Congress of the United States would prevent.

To-day, as then, the integrity of the Empire and the peace of the world are within the range of the problem of Palestine.

3. **The Provisions of the White Paper** are too often obscured by some of the propagandists of the Movement. We constantly hear "demands" for the total abrogation of that Paper, without disclosing to those unaware of its contents that practically only one of its provisions, out of many, is open to animadversion, that is the immigration bar.

Its official designation is the Palestine Statement of Policy (Command Paper 6019 of 1939). It sets out with admirable clarity the history of Palestine under British government in pursuance



of the Mandate, the obligations of that instrument, the nature of the Constitution created by it, the principles of justice to the two peoples, Arabs and Jews, in Palestine that should be applied, the nature of the "Jewish National Home" envisaged by the Balfour Declaration, and the Mandate, the Churchill Declaration in the Command Paper of 1922 to which Lord Balfour as a then member of the British Government was a party, negating the intention of the Balfour Declaration to create a Jewish State or to subordinate the Arab population to the Jews. It dealt with immigration and land transfer which are bound up and really constitute one question. The one point that cannot find literal justification in the Mandate or Balfour Declaration is the provision which (apart from a special provision of further 25,000 refugees) limits Jewish immigration to 10,000 a year for five years, after which Arab consent would be needed. It is THAT BAR that was declared by Mr. Churchill in a distinct interjection during the debate in May, 1939, to be objectionable. That bar, on the strict terms of constitutional documents, created a discrimination in favour of the Arabs and discrimination on the ground of race or religion is forbidden by the Mandate.

But the circumstances of its adoption as above related called into operation the fundamental consideration "*Salus populi suprema lex*". It was adopted under the shadow of impending war, amid the malignant influence of Nazi propaganda threatening the very existence of our Empire and that of the Jewish population of Palestine and indeed of the world.

The intransigent "demands" of the Zionist Movement, if acceded to as they stand to-day, would constitute a still greater breach of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate; they seek discrimination in favour of Jews alone; Arabs, whether Moslem or Christian, and Christians



everywhere are disregarded. This has been fully discussed.

Reference has been made to Mr. Churchill's Paper of 1922. This compels the question: **What of Mr. Churchill** in this connection? Some Zionists, ultra-Zionists, the most extreme of the Movement, present him as if he were wholly opposed to the policy of the White Paper of 1939. That is a picture both untrue in fact and in reality an indictment of him as wanting either in courage or honesty.

It is untrue, because his declared and repeated policy, never departed from, has been quite openly and definitely opposed to constituting Palestine a Jewish State.

It is unjust, as an indirect and wholly unjustifiable indictment for lack of courage or sincerity because though Prime Minister for nearly six years, and during the worst period of Jewish persecution, when by a stroke of the pen he could have annulled the immigration bar of the White Paper of 1939, he allowed it to remain, notwithstanding vehement Zionist "demands."

Why then did he not during this period strike out that bar? Obviously to every thinking mind, because he did not dare to imperil the general safety; because it might have meant what he termed the "liquidation of the Empire"; because it would assuredly have aroused such a storm of Moslem antagonism that might have involved among other calamities the utter ruin of Jewish hopes of Palestine.

This indirect impeachment, inescapable from the extreme Zionist point of view, is on a level with the same necessary and unjust imputation of moral obliquity to Lord Balfour when it is asserted that he intended his Declaration to promise a Jewish State regardless of Arab consent or acquiescence, entirely ignoring his participation as member of the Government in the Churchill White Paper of 1922, and his personal assurances



in two recorded speeches that Arab political rights were fully protected by the Māndate which embodied the Declaration.

4. **The Relation of the White Paper of 1939 to the position to-day** needs little comment. The insistent "demands" of the Movement for the total abrogation of the White Paper of 1939, their disregard of the Compact on the faith of which the Mandate was granted and accepted, their disregard of the undoubted rights of the majority of the present population of Palestine, the discrimination on the ground of race or religion, the attempt to desecrate the name of "Democracy" by first swamping the Arabs, and then permitting their domination by those of another specified religion, a process in blank defiance of the San Francisco Charter, a **contradiction of the Congressional Resolution of 1922**, a repudiation of the vital principles of the Mandate, and an anachronistic reversion to the Church-State Nationalism abandoned by civilised peoples for many centuries.

Not least for Jews who find their liberties and welfare guarded by British institutions it would create a situation not only regrettable but one which it is their solemn duty to avert.

5. **Immigration elsewhere than in Palestine.**

This question demands consideration for several reasons. The first in order of importance is the basic fact that the Political Zionist Movement rests on an assumption from which there is no escape that Jews all over the world are, have ever been, and should remain an Asiatic nation whose "homeland" not "was" but "is" and "will be" Palestine. That they are nowhere assimilated citizens of other lands, but merely "denizens" with a "RIGHT" to return to their "homeland".

I venture to affirm that that is not at this day a "Jewish" but merely a "Political Zionist" aspiration, and is opposed to the sentiments of the great majority of world-wide Jewry. I say this notwithstanding the admission of Professor



Brodetsky that the best Zionists desire to live in Palestine.

Then there has to be considered the present impossibility of providing a proper refuge in Palestine for all the factually homeless Jews of Europe. Even if the absorptive capacity of the country were to be regarded as the single test as some prominent leaders of the Movement appear to regard it for Jewish immigration into Palestine, it is not yet ready for them all. But I have no hesitation in saying there is no justification for claiming that absorptive capacity is the single test. To so regard it would be a manifest injustice and wholly improper.

It was stipulated as a maximum frontier beyond which immigration should not go however otherwise desirable. But the attempt to adopt it as the sole criterion is a dangerous misinterpretation of the Churchill Paper of 1922.

**As to the danger**, what has been already said on this point I do not repeat.

But reference may with advantage to those who desire information be made to two articles in the "Empire Digest" for August, 1945, namely "The Arab League", by Mr. Robin Campbell (p. 19), and "Britain Plans a New Suez Canal", by Mr. Hugh Prior (p. 27).

The first article and particularly at pp. 22-23 is highly informative as to Britain's danger should there be any attempt to override Arab opinion. I believe as I have said that abandonment of extreme Zionist "demands" could help to pave the way to an amicable and mutually advantageous arrangement.

The second article is a convincing statement of the impossibility, in view of the approaching termination of the Suez Canal concession, of Britain relinquishing her control of Palestine. The scheme foreshadowed by Mr. Lowdermilk will have to be materially reconsidered by the light of the new facts and features set forth in



the article. Certainly by all well-wishers of our British Commonwealth.

Possibilities of immigration elsewhere must be explored if the humanitarian principles put forward for factually homeless Jews are genuinely held and pursued. The Zionist political movement must cease; the United Nations have no more insistent duty than to provide, so far as they can without detriment to their own peoples, for sheltering those unfortunates among the Jews of Europe who have been the scapegoats of Nazi atrocity and have borne the greatest burden of misery that history records.

President Truman has recently announced that the United States is willing to help refugees to find a home in that hospitable country. England has done much in this direction and is doing more. To both gratitude is due. Australia can with benefit to herself and to the sufferers find room for many. Already the present Government has taken a praiseworthy first step in that direction. I commend to all who wish to read a truly Australian expression upon this subject to consult an article just published in the first number of "Challenge" (pp. 12-13), written by its editor, Mr. W. J. Thomas.

Again I would emphasise the absolute necessity of every Jewish immigrant — as with every other immigrant who desires Australian citizenship — to remember that Nationality is entirely distinct from Religion or Race. They are separate conceptions. The nationality must be Australian as a member of the British Commonwealth. No such nonsense as "Jewish Nationality" to bolster up Political Zionism must be uttered or taught. No such segregated group as was once contemplated for Kimberley can be tolerated in Australia. Assimilation, in the sense of complete absorption in the political and social and civic life of the Australian nation with but one "Homeland", our beloved Australia, and one undivided allegiance, is a *sine qua non*. He is not required to abjure



his religion or to forget or cease to venerate the history of his faith, or to surrender his love that is replete with sacred associations precious to his and kindred faiths.

But as Political Zionism "demands" for every Australian Jew, as for every Jew elsewhere, an internationally guaranteed political right to forsake at will his adopted country and to enter Palestine, a right not accorded to any other country, the Jewish immigrant and indeed every Jewish Australian must recognise the utter inconsistency of Political Zionism with the well-established principles of nationality at the present day.

Those conditions, however, satisfied, and the ordinary safeguards necessary for protection from the standpoints of health, honesty and industry impartially preserved, I believe Australia can with great advantage to herself and our Empire admit to our thinly populated country a reasonable number of my co-religionists who are looking eagerly, anxiously, for not only a peaceful haven of safety for themselves and their descendants, but also for the opportunity of co-operating with their fellow-creatures in the noble work of progressive humanity.



## ADDENDUM.

### A CHRISTIAN APPEAL.

One of the most important recent documents on this question is the statement issued by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, under the title "The Palestine Question — A Christian Problem".

The Conference represents 121 Boards and Societies in the United States and Canada, representing 66 Christian Churches and 30 million Christians.

The statement is lengthy and is reproduced in full in the Information Bulletin of the American Council for Judaism for October 15, 1945.

The Palestine Problem is dealt with at length, with sympathy to Jews but with justice to Arabs, both Moslem and Christian.

I refer to only a very limited range of observations, which are indicative of the conclusions of the Conference.

Reference is made to Dr. Weizmann's moderate interpretation of Zionism in 1931, in which he said, *inter alia*:—"I have no sympathy or understanding with the demand for a Jewish majority in Palestine. . . . Why should we raise a demand which only makes a provocative impression?" Again the statement proceeds:—"It is upon British solidarity with the Arabs that the Homeland in the last analysis is built. With the momentum of change rapidly increasing throughout the Near East it seems highly unlikely that Britain or any other Power or combination of Powers, will undertake to coerce the Arabs in Palestine. And under the new Charter of the United Nations it would be anomalous to attempt to care for Jewish need at the cost of a small and unwilling ward of its own self-government".



The whole statement is worthy of earnest consideration. But its concluding paragraph is one that calls for the generous recognition and deep gratitude of every Jew who places justice, respect for other faiths, and humanitarianism above mere political aspirations, which at best are but the dry bones of a long vanished past. That paragraph I quote in full. It is as follows:—

#### **“AND ANTI-SEMITISM?”**

A last question remains for Christians to answer. We must remember that it was not with the Arabs that anti-Semitism originated nor in their culture that it rooted and flourished. Are we Christians ready to confess that Christianity has no more certain cure to offer than geographical concentration of the Jewish people, and that questionable good, national sovereignty? We believe that the future of Christianity depends upon the heart with which Christians now attack this menace to all that we have put our faith in for nineteen centuries. We believe that a demonstration of Christian justice towards the Arabs would do much to stem the anti-Jewish tide in Moslem lands. We call upon Christian leaders here and now to initiate a more positive and vigorous programme to eradicate anti-Semitic feeling in our own country. Can we ourselves claim the name of Christian if we are not ready to share suffering and to carry some of the weight of the heavy cross that bears down upon Israel, the people of whom Jesus was born?”

Is Political Zionism prepared to exhibit the same nobility of soul?

14th January, 1946